

ON THE CLASSIFICATION OF SUBALGEBRAS OF Cend_N AND gc_N

CARINA BOYALLIAN, VICTOR G. KAC AND JOSE I. LIBERATI

ABSTRACT. The problem of classification of infinite subalgebras of Cend_N and of gc_N that acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ is discussed in this paper.

0. INTRODUCTION

Since the pioneering papers [BPZ] and [Bo], there has been a great deal of work towards understanding of the algebraic structure underlying the notion of the operator product expansion (OPE) of chiral fields of a conformal field theory. The singular part of the OPE encodes the commutation relations of fields, which leads to the notion of a Lie conformal algebra [K1-2].

In the past few years a structure theory [DK], representation theory [CK, CKW] and cohomology theory [BKV] of finite Lie conformal algebras has been developed.

The associative conformal algebra Cend_N and the corresponding general Lie conformal algebra gc_N are the most important examples of simple conformal algebras which are not finite (see Sect. 2.10 in [K1]). One of the most urgent open problems of the theory of conformal algebras is the classification of infinite subalgebras of Cend_N and of gc_N which act irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. (For a classification of such finite algebras, in the associative case see Theorem 5.2 of the present paper, and in the (more difficult) Lie case see [CK] and [DK].)

The classical Burnside theorem states that any subalgebra of the matrix algebra $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}$ that acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}^N$ is the whole algebra $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}$. This is certainly not true for subalgebras of Cend_N (which is the “conformal” analogue of $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}$). There is a family of infinite subalgebras $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ of Cend_N , where $P(x) \in \text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}[x]$, $\det P(x) \neq 0$, that still act irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. One of the conjectures of [K2] states that there are no other infinite irreducible subalgebras of Cend_N .

One of the results of the present paper is the classification of all subalgebras of Cend_1 and determination of the ones that act irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ (Theorem 2.2). This result proves the above-mentioned conjecture in the case $N = 1$. For general

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

N we can prove this conjecture only under the assumption that the subalgebra in question is unital (see Theorem 5.3). This result is closely related to a difficult theorem of A. Retakh [R] (but we avoid using it).

Next, we describe all finite irreducible modules over $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ (see Corollary 3.7). This is done by using the description of left ideals of the algebras $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ (see Proposition 1.6a). Further, we describe all extensions between non-trivial finite irreducible $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules and between non-trivial finite irreducible and trivial finite dimensional modules (Theorem 3.10). This leads us to a complete description of finite Cend_N -modules (Theorem 3.28).

Next we describe all automorphisms of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ (Theorems 4.2 and 4.3). We also classify all homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N (Theorem 4.6). This gives, in particular, a classification of anti-involutions of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$. One case of such an anti-involution ($N = 1$, $P = x$) was studied by S. Bloch [B] on the level of the Lie algebra of differential operators on the circle to link representations of the corresponding subalgebra to the values of ζ -function. Representation theory of the subalgebra corresponding to the anti-involution of Cend_1 was developed in [KWY].

The subspace of anti-fixed points of an anti-involution of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ is a Lie conformal subalgebra that still acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. This leads us to Conjecture 6.20 on classification of infinite Lie conformal subalgebras of gc_N acting irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. This conjecture agrees with the results of the papers [Z] and [DeK].

We thank B. Bakalov for providing his results on the subject of the paper, and we also thank D. Djokovic for Theorem 4.25 and very useful correspondence.

1. LEFT AND RIGHT IDEALS OF $\text{CEND}_{N,P}$

First we introduce the basic definitions and notations, see [K1]. An *associative conformal algebra* R is defined as a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module endowed with a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map,

$$R \otimes R \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes R, \quad a \otimes b \mapsto a_\lambda b$$

called the λ -product, and satisfying the following axioms ($a, b, c \in R$),

$$(A1)_\lambda \quad (\partial a)_\lambda b = -\lambda(a_\lambda b), \quad a_\lambda(\partial b) = (\lambda + \partial)(a_\lambda b)$$

$$(A2)_\lambda \quad a_\lambda(b_\mu c) = (a_\lambda b)_{\lambda+\mu} c$$

An associative conformal algebra is called *finite* if it has finite rank as $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module. The notions of homomorphism, ideal and subalgebras of an associative conformal algebra are defined in the usual way.

A *module* over an associative conformal algebra R is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module M endowed with a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $R \otimes M \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes M$, denoted by $a \otimes v \mapsto a_\lambda^M v$, satisfying the

properties:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial a)_\lambda^M v &= [\partial^M, a_\lambda^M]v = -\lambda(a_\lambda^M v), \quad a \in R, v \in M, \\ a_\lambda^M(b_\mu^M v) &= (a_\lambda b)_\lambda^M v, \quad a, b \in R. \end{aligned}$$

An R -module M is called *trivial* if $a_\lambda v = 0$ for all $a \in R, v \in M$ (but it may be non-trivial as a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module).

Given two $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -modules U and V , a *conformal linear map* from U to V is a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $a : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$, denoted by $a_\lambda : U \rightarrow V$, such that $[\partial, a_\lambda] = -\lambda a_\lambda$, that is $\partial^V a_\lambda - a_\lambda \partial^U = -\lambda a_\lambda$. The vector space of all such maps, denoted by $\text{Chom}(U, V)$, is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module with

$$(\partial a)_\lambda := -\lambda a_\lambda.$$

Now, we define $\text{Cend}V := \text{Chom}(V, V)$ and, provided that V is a finite $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module, $\text{Cend}V$ has a canonical structure of an associative conformal algebra defined by

$$(a_\lambda b)_\mu v = a_\lambda(b_{\mu-\lambda} v), \quad a, b \in \text{Cend}V, v \in V.$$

Remark 1.1. Observe that, by definition, a structure of a conformal module over an associative conformal algebra R in a finite $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module V is the same as a homomorphism of R to the associative conformal algebra $\text{Cend}V$.

For a positive integer N , let $\text{Cend}_N = \text{Cend} \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. It can also be viewed as the associative conformal algebra associated to the associative algebra $\text{Diff}^N \mathbb{C}^\times$ of all $N \times N$ matrix valued regular differential operators on $\mathbb{C}^\times$, that is (see Sect. 2.10 in [K1] for more details)

$$\text{Conf}(\text{Diff}^N \mathbb{C}^\times) = \oplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{C}[\partial] J^n \otimes \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$$

with λ -product given by $(J_A^k = J^k \otimes A)$

$$J_A^k \lambda J_B^l = \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} (\lambda + \partial)^j J_{AB}^{k+l-j}.$$

Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, the natural representation of $\text{Diff}^N \mathbb{C}^\times$ on $e^{-\alpha t} \mathbb{C}^N[t, t^{-1}]$ gives rise a conformal module structure on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ over $\text{Conf}(\text{Diff}^N \mathbb{C}^\times)$, with λ -action

$$J_A^m \lambda v = (\lambda + \partial + \alpha)^m A v, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+, v \in \mathbb{C}^N.$$

Now, using Remark 1.1, we obtain a natural homomorphism of conformal associative algebras from $\text{Conf}(\text{Diff}^N \mathbb{C}^\times)$ to Cend_N , which turns out to be an isomorphism (see [DK] and Proposition 2.10 in [K1]).

In order to simplify the notation, we will introduce the following bijective map, called the *symbol*,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Symb} : \quad \text{Cend}_N &\longrightarrow \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[\partial, x] \\ \sum_k A_k(\partial) J^k &\longmapsto \sum_k A_k(\partial) x^k \end{aligned}$$

where $A_k(\partial) \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[\partial])$. The transferred λ -product is

$$A(\partial, x)_{\lambda} B(\partial, x) = A(-\lambda, x + \lambda + \partial) B(\lambda + \partial, x). \quad (1.1)$$

The above λ -action of Cend_N on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ is given by the following formula:

$$A(\partial, x)_{\lambda} v(\partial) = A(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + \alpha) v(\lambda + \partial), \quad v(\partial) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N. \quad (1.2)$$

Note also that under the change of basis of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ by the invertible matrix $C(\partial)$, the symbol $A(\partial, x)$ changes by the formula:

$$A(\partial, x) \longmapsto C(\partial + x) A(\partial, x) C(x)^{-1}. \quad (1.3)$$

Observe that for any $C(x) \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$, with non-zero constant determinant, the map (1.3) gives us an automorphism of Cend_N .

It follows immediately from the formula for λ -product that

$$\text{Cend}_{P,N} := P(x + \partial)(\text{Cend}_N) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Cend}_{N,P} := (\text{Cend}_N)P(x),$$

with $P(x) \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$, are right and left ideals, respectively, of Cend_N . Another important subalgebra is

$$\text{Cur}_N := \text{Cur}(\text{Mat}_N) = \mathbb{C}[\partial](\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}). \quad (1.4)$$

Remark 1.5. If $P(x)$ is nondegenerate, i.e., $\det P(x) \neq 0$, then by elementary transformations over the rows (left multiplications) we can make $P(x)$ upper triangular without changing $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$. After that, applying to $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ an automorphism of Cend_N of the form (1.3), with $\det C(x) = 1$ (in order to multiply P on the right, which are elementary transformations over the columns), we get $\text{Cend}_{N,P} \simeq \text{Cend}_{N,D}$, with $D = \text{diag}(p_1(x), \dots, p_N(x))$, where $p_i(x)$ are monic polynomials such that $p_i(x)$ divides $p_{i+1}(x)$. The $p_i(x)$ are called the elementary divisors of P . So, up to conjugation, all $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ are parameterized by the sequence of elementary divisors of P .

All left and right ideals of Cend_N were obtained by B. Bakalov. Now, we extend the classification to $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$.

Proposition 1.6. *a) All left ideals in $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$, with $\det P(x) \neq 0$, are of the form $\text{Cend}_{N,QP}$, where $Q(x) \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$.*

b) All right ideals in $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$, with $\det P(x) \neq 0$, are of the form $Q(\partial + x)\text{Cend}_{N,P}$, where $Q(x) \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$.

Proof. (a) By Remark 1.5, we may suppose that P is diagonal with $\det P(x) \neq 0$. Denote by $p_1(x), \dots, p_N(x)$ the diagonal coefficients.

Let $J \subseteq \text{Cend}_N$ be a left ideal. First, let us see that J is generated over $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ by $I := J \cap \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$. If $a(\partial, x) = \sum_{i=0}^m \partial^i a_i(x) \in J$, then

$$\begin{aligned} E_{k,k}P(x)_\lambda a(\partial, x) &= p_k(\lambda + \partial + x)E_{k,k}a(\lambda + \partial, x) \\ &= p_k(\lambda + \partial + x)E_{k,k}\left(\sum_i (\lambda + \partial)^i a_i(x)\right) \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes J, \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

using that $\det P(x) \neq 0$ and considering the maximal coefficient in λ of (1.7), we get $E_{k,k}a_m(x) \in J$ for all k . Hence $a_m(x) \in J$. Applying the same argument to $a(\partial, x) - \partial^m a_m(x) \in J$, and so on, we get $a_i(x) \in J$ for all i . Therefore, J is generated over $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ by $I := J \cap \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$.

If $a(x) \in I$, then

$$E_{i,j}P(x)_\lambda a(x) = p_j(\lambda + \partial + x)E_{i,j}a(x) = \lambda^{max} E_{i,j}a(x) + \text{lower terms} \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes J. \quad (1.8)$$

Therefore, $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}) \cdot I \subseteq I$.

Now, considering the next coefficient in λ in (1.8) if p_j is non-constant, or the constant term in λ of $x E_{i,j}P(x)_\lambda a(x)$ if p_j is constant, we get that $xa(x) \in I$. It follows that I is a left ideal of $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$. But all left ideals of $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$ are principal, i.e. of the form $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])R(x)$, since $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$ and $\mathbb{C}[x]$ are Morita equivalent. This completes the proof of (a).

In a similar way, but using the expression $a(\partial, x) = \sum_i \partial^i \tilde{a}_i(\partial + x)$, we get (b). $\square$

Proposition 1.9. *$\text{Cend}_{N,P} \simeq B(\partial + x)(\text{Cend}_N)A(x)$ if $P(x) = A(x)B(x)$. In particular, $\text{Cend}_{N,P} \simeq \text{Cend}_{P,N}$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the map $a(\partial, x)P(x) \rightarrow B(\partial + x)a(\partial, x)A(x)$ is an isomorphism provided that $P(x) = A(x)B(x)$. $\square$

2. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBALGEBRAS OF Cend_1

We can identify Cend_1 with $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$, then the λ -product is

$$r(\partial, x) \lambda s(\partial, x) = r(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x) s(\lambda + \partial, x), \quad (2.1)$$

where $r(\partial, x), s(\partial, x) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$.

The main result of this section is

Theorem 2.2. *a) Any subalgebra of $Cend_1$ is one of the following:*

- (1) $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$;
- (2) $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] p(x)$, with $p(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$;
- (3) $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] q(\partial + x)$, with $q(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$;
- (4) $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] p(x) q(\partial + x) = \mathbb{C}[\partial, x] p(x) \cap \mathbb{C}[\partial, x] q(\partial + x)$, with $p(x), q(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$.

b) The subalgebras $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] p(x)$ with $p(x) \neq 0$, and $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ are all the subalgebras of $Cend_1$ that act irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$.

In order to prove Theorem 2.2, we first need some lemmas and the following important notation. Given $r(\partial, x) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$, we denote by r_i and $\tilde{r}_j$ the coefficients uniquely determined by

$$r(\partial, x) = \sum_{i=0}^n r_i(x) \partial^i = \sum_{j=0}^m \tilde{r}_j(\partial + x) \partial^j \quad (2.3)$$

with $r_n(x) \neq 0$ and $\tilde{r}_m(\partial + x) \neq 0$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let S be a subalgebra of $Cend_1$, let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be two non-constant polynomials, and let $t(\partial) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]$ be a non-zero polynomial.*

- (a) *If $t(\partial) \in S$, then $\mathbb{C}[\partial] \subseteq S$.*
- (b) *If $t(\partial), r(\partial, x) \in S$ and $r(\partial, x)$ depends non-trivially on x , then $S = Cend_1$. In particular, if $1 \in S$, then either $S = \mathbb{C}[\partial]$ or $S = Cend_1$.*
- (c) *If $p(x) \in S$, then $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] p(x) \subseteq S$.*
- (d) *If $q(\partial + x) \in S$, then $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] q(\partial + x) \subseteq S$.*
- (e) *If $p(x)q(\partial + x) \in S$, then $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] p(x) q(\partial + x) \subseteq S$.*

Proof. (a) If $t(\partial) \in S$, we deduce from the maximal coefficient in λ of $t(\partial) \lambda t(\partial) = t(-\lambda) t(\lambda + \partial)$ that $1 \in S$, proving (a).

(b) From (a), we have that $1 \in S$. Then the coefficients of λ in $r(\partial, x) \lambda 1 = r(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x)$ are in S . Therefore, using notation (2.3), we obtain that $\tilde{r}_j(\partial + x) \in S$ for all j . Since $r(\partial, x)$ depends non-trivially on x , there exist j_0 such that $\tilde{r}_{j_0}$ is non-constant, that is $\tilde{r}_{j_0}(z) = \sum_{i=0}^l a_i z^i$ with $a_l \neq 0$ and $l > 0$. Now, using that $\mathbb{C}[\partial] \subseteq S$ and

$$1 \lambda \tilde{r}_{j_0}(\partial + x) = \tilde{r}_{j_0}(\lambda + \partial + x) = \lambda^l + (l a_l(\partial + x) + a_{l-1}) \lambda^{l-1} + \text{lower powers in } \lambda$$

we obtain that $x \in S$. Then by induction and taking λ -products of type $x \lambda x^k$ we see that $x^{k+1} \in S$ for all $k \geq 1$, proving (b).

(c) Let $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$, with $a_n \neq 0$ and $n > 0$. Then, considering the coefficient of λ^{n-1} in $p(x) \lambda p(x) = p(\lambda + \partial + x)p(x)$, we get that

$(n a_n (\partial + x) + a_{n-1}) p(x) \in S$. Since S is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module, we have $\partial p(x) \in S$, obtaining that $x p(x) \in S$. Applying this argument to $x p(x)$, we get that $x^2 p(x) \in S$, etc, and $x^k p(x) \in S$ for all $k > 0$, proving (c).

(d) The proof is identical to that of (c).

(e) Assume that $q(x + \partial)p(x) \in S$. Then, we compute $q(x + \partial)p(x)_\lambda q(x + \partial)p(x) = q(x + \partial)p(\lambda + \partial + x)q(\lambda + x + \partial)p(x)$, and looking at the monomial of highest degree minus one, we get that $(x + \partial)q(x + \partial)p(x) \in S$, and since by definition S is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module, we deduce that $q(x + \partial)\tilde{p}(x) := xq(x + \partial)p(x) \in S$. Applying this argument to $q(x + \partial)\tilde{p}(x)$ we deduce that $x^k q(x + \partial)p(x) \in S$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and therefore $q(x + \partial)p(x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] \subseteq S$. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Let S be a subalgebra of Cend_1 which does not contain 1.*

(a) *Let $p(x)$ be of minimal degree such that $p(x) \in S$. Then $\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]p(x) = S$.*

(b) *Let $q(\partial + x)$ be of minimal degree such that $q(\partial + x) \in S$. Then $S = \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]q(\partial + x)$.*

(c) *Let $q(\partial + x)p(x)$ be of minimal degree (in x) such that $q(\partial + x)p(x) \in S$. Then $S = p(x)q(\partial + x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$.*

Proof. (a) From Lemma 2.4.(c), we have that $p(x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] \subseteq S$ (by our assumption, $p(x)$ is non-constant). Now, suppose that there exist $q(\partial, x) \in S$ with $q(\partial, x) \notin p(x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$ and p as above. Then, by applying the division algorithm to each coefficient of $q(\partial, x) = \sum_{k=0}^l q_k(x)\partial^k$, we may write $q(\partial, x) = t(\partial, x)p(x) + r(\partial, x)$ with $r(\partial, x) = \sum_{k=0}^n r_k(x)\partial^k = \sum_{j=0}^m \tilde{r}_j(\partial + x)\partial^k$ and $\deg r_k < \deg p$ (cf. notation (2.3)). Using that $p(x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] \subseteq S$, we obtain that $r(\partial, x) \in S$. Now, since

$$r(\partial, x)_\lambda r(\partial, x) = r(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x)r(\lambda + \partial, x), \quad (2.6)$$

looking at the coefficient of maximum degree in λ in (2.6), we get: $r_n(x)\tilde{r}_m(x + \partial) \in S$. By our assumption, one of the polynomials in this product is non-constant. If $\tilde{r}_m(x + \partial)$ is constant, then $r_n(x) \in S$, but $\deg r_n < \deg p$ which is a contradiction. If $r_n(x)$ is constant, then $\tilde{r}_m(x + \partial) \in S$. Then, looking at the leading coefficient of the following polynomial in λ : $p(x)_\lambda \tilde{r}_m(x + \partial) = p(\lambda + \partial + x)\tilde{r}_m(x + \lambda + \partial)$ we have that $1 \in S$, which contradicts our assumption.

If neither $\tilde{r}_m(x + \partial)$ nor $r_n(x)$ are constants, we look at $p(x)_\lambda \tilde{r}_m(x + \partial)r_n(x) = p(\lambda + \partial + x)\tilde{r}_m(\lambda + x + \partial)r_n(x) \in S$ and looking at the coefficient of maximum degree in λ we get that $r_n(x) \in S$, which contradicts the minimality of $p(x)$.

(b) The proof is the same as that of (a).

(c) We may assume that p and q are non-constant polynomials, otherwise we are in the cases (a) or (b). By Lemma 2.4(e), we have $p(x)q(x + \partial)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x] \subseteq S$. Let $t(\partial, x) \in S$, but $t(\partial, x) \notin \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]p(x)q(x + \partial)$. Then we may have three cases:

- (1) $t(\partial, x) \in p(x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$ or
- (2) $t(\partial, x) \in q(\partial + x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$ or
- (3) $t(\partial, x) \notin p(x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$ nor $t(\partial, x) \notin q(\partial + x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$.

Note that these cases are mutually exclusive. Suppose we are in Case (1), so that $t(\partial, x) = p(x)r(\partial, x)$ with $r(\partial, x) \notin q(\partial + x)\mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$. Then we get $r(\partial, x) = q(\partial + x)\tilde{r}(\partial, x) + s(\partial, x)$, with $s(\partial, x) \neq 0$, and (using notation (2.3)) $\deg \tilde{s}_k < \deg q$ for all $k = 0, \dots, m$. Therefore, we have that $t(\partial, x) = p(x)r(\partial, x) = p(x)q(\partial + x)\tilde{r}(\partial, x) + p(x)s(\partial, x)$ and then $p(x)s(\partial, x) \in S$. Now, we can compute:

$$p(x)s(\partial, x)_\lambda p(x)q(\partial + x) = p(\lambda + \partial + x)s(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x)p(x)q(\lambda + \partial + x)$$

and looking at the coefficient of maximum degree in λ , we have (using notation (2.3)) that $p(x)\tilde{s}_m(\partial + x) \in S$ which is a contradiction.

Similarly, Case (2) also leads to a contradiction.

In the remaining Case (3) we may assume that $\deg p \leq \deg q$ since the case of the opposite inequality is completely analogous. We have $t(\partial, x) \in S$, but $t(\partial, x) \notin \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]p(x)$. Then

$$t(\partial, x) = p(x)h(\partial, x) + r(\partial, x) \tag{2.7}$$

with $0 \neq r(\partial, x) = \sum_{k=0}^n r_k(x)\partial^k = \sum_{j=0}^m \tilde{r}_j(\partial + x)\partial^k$ where $\deg r_k < \deg p$ and $\deg \tilde{r}_j < \deg p$.

If $h(\partial, x) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]q(\partial + x)$, then $r(\partial, x) \in S$, but the leading coefficient of

$$p(x)q(\partial + x)_\lambda r(\partial, x) = p(\lambda + \partial + x)q(\partial + x)r(\lambda + \partial, x)$$

is in S which is $q(\partial + x)r_n(x)$, and this contradicts the assumption of minimality of $p(x)q(\partial + x)$.

So, suppose that $h(\partial, x) \notin \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]q(\partial + x)$. Then $h(\partial, x) = \tilde{h}(\partial, x)q(\partial + x) + s(\partial, x)$ with $0 \neq s(\partial, x) = \sum_{k=0}^l s_k(x)\partial^k = \sum_{j=0}^m \tilde{s}_j(\partial + x)\partial^k$ and $\deg \tilde{s}_j < \deg q$. By (2.7) we have $p(x)s(\partial, x) + r(\partial, x) \in S$. Now, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} (p(x)s(\partial, x) + r(\partial, x))_\lambda p(x)q(\partial + x) \\ = (p(\lambda + \partial + x)s(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x) + r(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x))p(x)q(\lambda + \partial + x) \end{aligned}$$

Then the leading coefficient in λ is either $p(x)\tilde{s}_m(\partial + x) \in S$, which is impossible since $\deg \tilde{s}_m < \deg q$, or $p(x)\tilde{r}_m(\partial + x) \in S$. But in the latter case, $\deg \tilde{r}_m \geq \deg q$, but by construction $\deg \tilde{r}_m < \deg p$, and this contradicts the assumption $\deg p \leq \deg q$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. (a) Let S be a non-zero subalgebra of Cend_1 . If $S \subseteq \mathbb{C}[\partial]$ then by Lemma 2.4.(a) we have that $S = \mathbb{C}[\partial]$. Therefore we may assume that there is $r(\partial, x) \in S$ which depends nontrivially on x . Recall that we can write $r(\partial, x) = \sum_{i=0}^m p_i(x)\partial^i = \sum_{j=0}^n q_j(\partial+x)\partial^j$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\partial, x) \lambda r(\partial, x) &= r(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + x) r(\lambda + \partial, x) = \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^n q_j(\partial+x) p_i(x) (-\lambda)^j (\lambda + \partial)^i \end{aligned}$$

Then, considering the leading coefficient of this λ -polynomial, we have $p_m(x)q_n(\partial+x) \in S$. Therefore, we may have one of the following situations:

- (1) $p_m(x)$ and $q_n(\partial+x)$ are constant,
- (2) $q_n(\partial+x)$ is constant and $p_m(x)$ is non-constant,
- (3) $p_m(x)$ is constant and $q_n(\partial+x)$ is non-constant, or
- (4) both polynomials non-constant.

Let us see what happens in each case:

- (1) By Lemma 2.4.(b), we have that $S = \text{Cend}_1$.
- (2) In this case, we may take $p(x) \in S$ of minimal degree, then using Lemma 2.5.(a) we have $S = \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]p(x)$.
- (3) It is completely analogous to (2).
- (4) Here, we have that $p(x)q(x+\partial) \in S$ and, again we may assume that it has minimal degree. Now, by Lemma 2.5.(c), we finish the proof of (a).

The proof of (b) is straightforward. $\square$

3. FINITE MODULES OVER $\text{CEND}_{N,P}$

Given R an associative conformal algebra (not necessarily finite), we will establish a correspondence between the set of maximal left ideals of R and the set of irreducible R -modules. Then we will apply it to the subalgebras $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$.

First recall that the following property holds in an R -module M (cf. Remark 3.3 [DK]):

$$a_\lambda(b_{-\partial-\mu}v) = (a_\lambda b)_{-\partial-\mu}v \quad a, b \in R, v \in M. \quad (3.1)$$

Remark 3.2. (a) Let $v \in M$ and fix $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, then due to (3.1) we have that $R_{-\partial-\mu}v$ is an R -submodule of M .

- (b) $\text{Tor } M$ is a trivial R -submodule of M (Lemma 8.2, [DK]).
- (c) If M is irreducible and $M = \text{Tor } M$, then $M \simeq \mathbb{C}$.
- (d) If M is a non-trivial finite irreducible R -module, then M is free as a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module.

Lemma 3.3. *Let M be a non-trivial irreducible R -module. Then there exists $v \in M$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $R_{-\partial-\mu}v \neq 0$. In particular, $R_{-\partial-\mu}v = M$ if M is irreducible.*

Proof. Suppose that $R_{-\partial-\mu}v = 0$ for all $v \in M$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, then we have that $r_{-\partial-\mu}v = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}[\mu] \otimes M$ for all $r \in R$ and $v \in M$. Thus writing down $r_{-\partial-\mu}v$ as a polynomial in μ and looking at the n -products that are going to appear in this expansion, we conclude that $r_\lambda v = 0$ for all $v \in M$ and $r \in R$. Hence M is a trivial R -module, a contradiction. $\square$

By Lemma 3.3, given a non-trivial irreducible R -module M we can fix $v \in M$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $R_{-\partial-\mu}v = M$ and consider the following map

$$\phi : R \rightarrow M, \quad r \mapsto r_{-\partial-\mu}v.$$

Observe that $\phi(\partial r) = (\partial + \mu)\phi(r)$ and using (3.1) we also have $\phi(r_\lambda s) = r_\lambda \phi(s)$. Therefore, the map ϕ is a homomorphism of R -modules into $M_{-\mu}$, where $M_{-\mu}$ is the μ -twisted module of M obtained by replacing ∂ by $\partial + \mu$ in the formulas for the action of R on M , and $\text{Ker}(\phi)$ is a maximal left ideal of R . Clearly this map is onto $M_{-\mu}$.

Therefore we have that $M_{-\mu} \simeq (R/\text{Ker } \phi)$ as R -modules, or equivalently,

$$M \simeq (R/\text{Ker } \phi)_\mu. \quad (3.4)$$

On the other hand, it is immediate that given any maximal left ideal I of R , we have that $(R/I)_\mu$ is an irreducible R -module. Therefore we have proved the following

Theorem 3.5. *Formula (3.4) defines a surjective map from the set of maximal left ideals of R to the set of equivalence classes of non-trivial irreducible R -modules.*

Remark 3.6. (a) Observe that given an R -module M and $v \in M$, the set $I = \{a \in R \mid a_\lambda v = 0\}$ is a left ideal, but not necessarily $M \simeq R/I$. For example, consider $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ as a Cend_1 -module, then the kernel of $a \mapsto a_\lambda v$ is $\{0\}$.

(b) If we fix $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, there are examples of irreducible modules where $R_{-\partial-\mu}v = 0$ for all $v \in M$ (cf. Lemma 3.3). Indeed, consider $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ as a $\text{Cend}_{1,(x+\mu)}$ -module.

Using Remark 3.2, Proposition 1.6 and Theorem 3.5, we have

Corollary 3.7. *The $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -module $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ defined by (1.2) is irreducible if and only if $\det P(x) \neq 0$. These are all non-trivial irreducible $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules up to equivalence, provided that $\det P(x) \neq 0$.*

Note that Corollary 3.7 in the case $P(x) = I$, have been established earlier in [K2], by a completely different method (developed in [KR]).

A subalgebra S of Cend_N is called *irreducible* if S acts irreducibly in $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$.

Corollary 3.8. *The following subalgebras of Cend_N are irreducible: $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ with $\det P(x) \neq 0$, and Cur_N or conjugates of it by automorphisms (1.3).*

Remark 3.9. It is easy to show that every non-trivial irreducible representation of Cur_N is equivalent to the standard module $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$, and that every finite module over Cur_N is completely reducible.

We will finish this section with the classification of all extensions of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules involving the standard module $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ and finite dimensional trivial modules, and the classification of all finite modules over Cend_N .

We shall work with the standard irreducible $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -module $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ with λ -action (see (1.2))

$$a(\partial, x)P(x)_\lambda v(\partial) = a(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + \alpha)P(\lambda + \partial)v(\lambda + \partial).$$

Consider the trivial $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -module over the finite dimensional vector space V_T , whose $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module structure is given by the linear operator T , that is: $\partial \cdot v = T(v)$, $v \in V_T$. As usual, we may assume that $P(x) = \text{diag}\{p_1(x), \dots, p_N(x)\}$. We shall assume that $\det P \neq 0$.

Theorem 3.10. *a) There are no non-trivial extensions of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules of the form:*

$$0 \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow 0.$$

b) If there exists a non-trivial extension of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules of the form

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow E \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.11)$$

then $\det P(\alpha + c) = 0$ for some eigenvalue c of T . In this case, all torsionless extensions of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ by finite dimensional vector spaces, are parameterized by decompositions $P(x + \alpha) = R(x)S(x)$ and can be realized as follows. Consider the following isomorphism of conformal algebras:

$$\text{Cend}_{N,P} \rightarrow S(\partial + x)\text{Cend}_N R(x), \quad a(\partial, x)P(x) \mapsto S(\partial + x)a(\partial, x)R(x),$$

where $P(x + \alpha) = R(x)S(x)$, (this is the isomorphism between $\text{Cend}_{N,S}$ and $\text{Cend}_{S,N}$ (Proposition 1.9), restricted to $\text{Cend}_{N,R}S(x)$). Using this isomorphism, we get an action of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$:

$$a(\partial, x)P(x)_\lambda v(\partial) = S(\partial)a(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + \alpha)R(\lambda + \partial)v(\lambda + \partial).$$

Then $S(\partial)\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ is a submodule isomorphic to the standard module, of finite codimension in $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$.

c) If E is a non-trivial extension of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules of the form:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow 0,$$

then $E = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ as a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module (with trivial action of ∂ on $\mathbb{C}^2$) and $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ acts by

$$a(\partial, x)_\lambda(c(\partial) \otimes u) = a(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes J)c(\lambda + \partial)(1 \otimes u), \quad (3.12)$$

where J is a 2×2 Jordan block matrix.

Proof. a) Consider a short exact sequence of $R = \text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow E \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.13)$$

where V is irreducible finite, and T is trivial (finite dimensional vector space). Take $v \in E$ with $v \notin T$, and let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $A := R_{-\partial-\mu}v \neq 0$. Then we have three possibilities:

1) The image of A in V is 0, then $A = T$, which is impossible since A corresponds to a left ideal of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$.

2) The image of A in V is V and $A \cap T = 0$, then A is isomorphic to V , hence the exact sequence splits.

3) The image of A in V is V and $T' = A \cap T \neq 0$. Now, if $T' = T$ then $A = E$ and E is a cyclic module, which is impossible since it has torsion. If $T' \neq T$, we consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T' \rightarrow A \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$, by an inductive argument on the dimension of the trivial module, the last sequence split, i.e. $A = T' \oplus V' \subset E$ with $V' \simeq V$, hence $E = T \oplus V'$ as $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules, proving (a).

b) We may assume without loss of generality that $\alpha = 0$. Consider an extension of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules of the form (3.11). As a vector space $E = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \oplus V_T$. We have, for $v \in V_T$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial v &= T(v) + g_v(\partial), \text{ where } g_v(\partial) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N, \\ x^l BP(x)_\lambda v &= f_l^{v,B}(\lambda, \partial), \text{ where } f_l^{v,B}(\lambda, \partial) \in (\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N)[\lambda], B \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Let $P(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m Q_i x^i$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} (x^k AP(x)_\lambda x^l BP(x))_{\lambda+\mu} v &= (\lambda + \partial + x)^k AP(\lambda + \partial + x) x^l BP(x)_{\lambda+\mu} v \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^{i+k} \binom{i+k}{j} (\lambda + \partial)^{i+k-j} x^{j+l} A Q_i BP(x)_{\lambda+\mu} v \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^{i+k} \binom{i+k}{j} (-\mu)^{i+k-j} f_{j+l}^{v, A Q_i B}(\lambda + \mu, \partial) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x^k AP(x)_\lambda (x^l BP(x)_\mu v) &= x^k AP(x)_\lambda (f_l^{v,B}(\mu, \partial)) \\ &= (\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial) f_l^{v,B}(\mu, \lambda + \partial) \end{aligned}$$

must be equal by $(A2)_\lambda$, we have the functional equation

$$(\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial) f_l^{v,B}(\mu, \lambda + \partial) = \sum_{i=0}^m \sum_{j=0}^{i+k} \binom{i+k}{j} (-\mu)^{i+k-j} f_{j+l}^{v,AQ_i B}(\lambda + \mu, \partial). \quad (3.15)$$

If we put $\mu = 0$ in (3.15), we get

$$(\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial) f_l^{v,B}(0, \lambda + \partial) = \sum_{i=0}^m f_{i+k+l}^{v,AQ_i B}(\lambda, \partial). \quad (3.16)$$

Since the right-hand side of (3.16) is symmetric in k and l , so is the left-hand side, hence, in particular, we have

$$(\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial) f_0^{v,B}(0, \lambda + \partial) = AP(\lambda + \partial) f_k^{v,B}(0, \lambda + \partial).$$

Taking $A = I$ and using that $\det P \neq 0$, we get

$$f_k^{v,B}(0, \lambda + \partial) = (\lambda + \partial)^k f_0^{v,B}(0, \lambda + \partial). \quad (3.17)$$

Furthermore, by $(A1)_\lambda$, we have $[\partial, x^k AP(x)_\lambda]v = -\lambda x^k AP(x)_\lambda v$, which gives us the next condition:

$$(\lambda + \partial) f_k^{v,A}(\lambda, \partial) = f_k^{T(v),A}(\lambda, \partial) + (\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial) g_v(\lambda + \partial). \quad (3.18)$$

We shall prove that if c is an eigenvalue of T and $p_j(c) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq N$, then (after a change of complement) the generalized eigenspace of T corresponding to the eigenvalue c is a trivial submodule of E (hence is a non-zero torsion submodule). Indeed, let $\{v_1, \dots, v_s\}$ be vectors corresponding to one Jordan block of T associated to c , that is $T(v_1) = cv_1$ and $T(v_{i+1}) = cv_{i+1} + v_i$ for $i \geq 1$. Then (3.18) with $v = v_1$ becomes

$$(\lambda + \partial - c) f_k^{v_1,A}(\lambda, \partial) = (\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial) g_{v_1}(\lambda + \partial) \quad (3.19)$$

Observe that the right-hand side of (3.19) depends on $\lambda + \partial$, so $f_k^{v_1,A}(\lambda, \partial) = f_k^{v_1,A}(0, \lambda + \partial)$. Then using (3.17), we have

$$f_k^{v_1,A}(\lambda, \partial) = f_k^{v_1,A}(0, \lambda + \partial) = (\lambda + \partial)^k f_0^{v_1,A}(0, \lambda + \partial) = (\lambda + \partial)^k f_0^{v_1,A}(\lambda, \partial) \quad (3.20)$$

Similarly, considering (3.18) with $v = v_{i+1}$ ($i \geq 1$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + \partial - c)f_k^{v_{i+1},A}(\lambda, \partial) &= f_k^{v_i,A}(\lambda, \partial) + (\lambda + \partial)^k AP(\lambda + \partial)g_{v_{i+1}}(\lambda + \partial) \\ &= (\lambda + \partial)^k \left[f_0^{v_i,A}(0, \lambda + \partial) + AP(\lambda + \partial)g_{v_{i+1}}(\lambda + \partial) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Again, since the right hand side of (3.21) depends only on $\lambda + \partial$, we have that (3.20) also holds for any v_i .

Using that $p_j(c) \neq 0$ ($j = 1, \dots, N$) (recall that P is diagonal), and taking $A = E_{i,l}$, we obtain from (3.19) with $k = 0$ that

$$f_0^{v_1,A}(\lambda, \partial) = AP(\lambda + \partial)h_{v_1}(\lambda + \partial) \quad (3.22.a)$$

where $g_{v_1}(\partial) = (\partial - c)h_{v_1}(\partial)$. Now, (3.21) with $k = 0$ and $i = 1$ becomes (by (3.22.a))

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + \partial - c)f_0^{v_2,A}(\lambda, \partial) &= f_0^{v_1,A}(\lambda, \partial) + AP(\lambda + \partial)g_{v_2}(\lambda + \partial) \\ &= AP(\lambda + \partial)(h_{v_1}(\lambda + \partial) + g_{v_2}(\lambda + \partial)) \end{aligned}$$

As in (3.22.a), we get

$$f_0^{v_2,A}(\lambda, \partial) = AP(\lambda + \partial)h_{v_2}(\lambda + \partial)$$

where $g_{v_2}(\partial) + h_{v_1}(\partial) = (\partial - c)h_{v_2}(\partial)$. Similarly, we obtain for all $i \geq 1$,

$$f_0^{v_{i+1},A}(\lambda, \partial) = AP(\lambda + \partial)h_{v_{i+1}}(\lambda + \partial) \quad (3.22.b)$$

where $g_{v_{i+1}}(\partial) + h_{v_i}(\partial) = (\partial - c)h_{v_{i+1}}(\partial)$. Changing the basis to $v'_i = v_i - h_{v_i}(\partial)$, we have from (3.22.a-b) that $x^k AP(x)_\lambda v'_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial v'_1 &= T(v_1) + g_{v_1}(\partial) - \partial h_{v_1}(\partial) \\ &= cv_1 + (\partial - c)h_{v_1}(\partial) - \partial h_{v_1}(\partial) = cv'_1, \\ \partial v'_{i+1} &= T(v_{i+1}) + g_{v_{i+1}}(\partial) - \partial h_{v_{i+1}}(\partial) \\ &= cv_{i+1} + v_i + (\partial - c)h_{v_{i+1}}(\partial) - \partial h_{v_{i+1}}(\partial) - h_{v_i}(\partial) \\ &= cv'_{i+1} + v'_i. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Hence, the T -invariant subspace spanned by $\{v'_i\}$ is a trivial submodule of E . Therefore, if $p_j(c) \neq 0$ for all j and all eigenvalues c of T , then E is a trivial extension. This proves the first part of (b).

Now suppose that the extension E of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ by a finite dimensional vector space have no non-zero trivial submodule (equivalently, E is torsionless). By Remark 3.2.(b), E must be a free $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module of rank N .

Then, the problem reduces to the study of a $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -module structure on $E = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$, but using Remark 1.1, this is the same as a non-zero homomorphism from $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N . So, the end of this proof also gives us the classification of all these homomorphisms.

Denote by $\phi : \text{Cend}_{N,P} \rightarrow \text{Cend}_N$ the (non-zero) homomorphism associated to E . It is an embedding (due to irreducibility) of free $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -modules $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$, hence it is given by a non-degenerate matrix $S(\partial) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[\partial]$. Hence the action on E of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ is given by the formula:

$$\phi(a(\partial, x)P(x))_\lambda (S(\partial)v) = S(\partial) a(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + \alpha) P(\lambda + \partial + \alpha) v \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{C}^N.$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi(a(\partial, x)P(x)) S(x))_\lambda v &= \phi(a(\partial, x)P(x))_\lambda (S(\partial)v) \\ &= (S(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)P(x + \alpha))_\lambda v \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{C}^N. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\phi(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = S(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)P(x + \alpha)S^{-1}(x)$, and this is in Cend_N if and only if $R(x) := P(x + \alpha)S^{-1}(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$, proving b).

c) Consider a short exact sequence of $R = \text{Cend}_{N,P}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow E \rightarrow V' \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.26)$$

where V and V' are irreducible finite. Take $v \in E$ with $v \notin V$, and let $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $A := R_{-\partial-\mu}v \neq 0$. Then we have three possibilities:

- 1) The image of A in V' is 0, then $A = V$, which is impossible because $v \notin V$.
- 2) The image of A in V' is V' and $A \cap V = 0$, then A is isomorphic to V' , hence the exact sequence splits.

3) The image of A in V' is V' and $A \cap V = V$, hence $A = E$ and E is a cyclic module, hence corresponds to a left ideal which is contained in a unique max ideal (otherwise the sequence splits). It is easy to see then that E is the indecomposable module given in (3.12), where J is the 2×2 Jordan block. $\square$

Corollary 3.27. *There are no non-trivial extensions of Cend_N -modules of the form:*

$$0 \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{or} \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow E \rightarrow V_T \rightarrow 0$$

Theorem 3.28. *Every finite Cend_N -module is isomorphic to a direct sum of its (finite dimensional) trivial torsion submodule and a free finite $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \otimes T$ on which the λ -action is given by*

$$a(\partial, x)_\lambda(c(\partial) \otimes u) = a(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \alpha)c(\lambda + \partial)(1 \otimes u), \quad (3.29)$$

where α is an arbitrary operator on T .

Proof. Consider a short exact sequence of $R = \text{Cend}_N$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow E \rightarrow V' \rightarrow 0,$$

where V and V' are irreducible finite. By Theorem 3.10(c), the exact sequence splits or E is the indecomposable module that corresponds to a 2×2 Jordan block J , i.e., $E = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, and R acts via (3.29), where $S = 0$, $\beta = 0$ and $\alpha = J$.

Next, using Corollary 3.27, the short exact sequences of R -modules $0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow E \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow C \rightarrow E \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$, where C is a trivial 1-dimensional R -module, and V is a standard R -module (1.2), split.

Recall [K1] that an R -module is the same as a module over the associated extended annihilation algebra $(\text{Alg}R)^- = \mathbb{C}\partial \ltimes (\text{Alg}R)_-$, where $(\text{Alg}R)_-$ is the annihilation algebra. For $R = \text{Cend}_N$ one has:

$$(\text{Alg}R)_- = (\text{Diff}^N \mathbb{C}), (\text{Alg}R)^- = \mathbb{C}\partial \ltimes (\text{Alg}R)_-,$$

where ∂ acts on $(\text{Alg}R)_-$ via $-ad\partial_t$. Furthermore, viewed as an $(\text{Alg}R)_-$ -module, all modules (1.2) are equivalent to the module $F = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]^N / \mathbb{C}[t]^N$, and the modules (1.2) are obtained by letting ∂ act as $-\partial_t + \alpha$.

Let M be a finite R -module. Then it has finite length and, by Corollary 3.7, all its irreducible subquotients are either trivial 1-dimensional or are isomorphic to a standard R -module (1.2). Since in the case b) above, the exact sequence splits when restricted to $(\text{Alg}R)_-$, we conclude that, viewed as an $(\text{Alg}R)_-$ -module, M is a finite direct sum of modules equivalent to F or trivial 1-dimensional. Thus, viewed as an $(\text{Alg}R)_-$ -module, $M = S \oplus (F \otimes T)$, where S and T are trivial $(\text{Alg}R)_-$ -modules. The only way to extend this M to an $(\text{Alg}R)^-$ -module is to let ∂ act as operators α and β on T and S , respectively, and as $-\partial_t$ on F , which gives (3.29). $\square$

4. AUTOMORPHISMS AND ANTI-AUTOMORPHISMS OF $\text{CEND}_{N,P}$

A $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -linear map $\sigma : R \rightarrow S$ between two associative conformal algebras is called a *homomorphism* (resp. *anti-homomorphism*) if

$$\sigma(a_\lambda b) = \sigma(a)_\lambda \sigma(b) \quad (\text{resp } \sigma(a_\lambda b) = \sigma(b)_{-\lambda-\partial} \sigma(a)).$$

An anti-automorphism σ is an *anti-involution* if $\sigma^2 = 1$.

An important example of an anti-involution of Cend_N is:

$$\sigma(A(\partial, x)) = A^t(\partial, -x - \partial) \quad (4.1)$$

where the superscript t stands for the transpose of a matrix.

By Corollary 3.7 we know that all irreducible finite Cend_N -modules are of the form ($\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$):

$$A(\partial, x)_\lambda v(\partial) = A(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial + \alpha)v(\lambda + \partial).$$

Hence, twisting one of these modules by an automorphism of Cend_N gives again one of these modules, and we get the following

Theorem 4.2. *All automorphisms of Cend_N are of the form:*

$$A(\partial, x) \mapsto C(\partial + x)A(\partial, x + \alpha)C(x)^{-1},$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $C(x)$ is a matrix with a non-zero constant determinant.

This result can be generalized as follows.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $P(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ with $\det P(x) \neq 0$. Then all automorphisms of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ are those that come from Cend_N by restriction. More precisely, any automorphism is of the form:*

$$A(\partial, x)P(x) \mapsto C(\partial + x)A(\partial, x + \alpha)B(x)P(x), \quad (4.4)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, and $B(x)$ and $C(x)$ are invertible matrices in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ such that

$$P(x + \alpha) = B(x)P(x)C(x). \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. Let $\pi'(a) = \pi(s(a))$, where π is the standard representation and s is an automorphism of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$. Since it is equivalent to the standard representation due to Corollary 3.7, we deduce that $s(a(\partial, x)) = C(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)C(x)^{-1}$ for some invertible (in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$) matrix $C(x)$. But $C(\partial + x)\text{Cend}_{N,P}C(x)^{-1} = \text{Cend}_{N,P}$ if and only if (4.5) holds. Indeed, we have: $C(\partial + x)P(x + \alpha)C(x)^{-1} = A(\partial, x)P(x)$ for some $A(\partial, x) \in \text{Cend}_N$. Taking determinants of both sides of this equality, we see that $\det A(\partial, x)$ is a non-zero constant. Hence $B(x) := P(x + \alpha)C(x)^{-1}P(x)^{-1}$ is invertible in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$, finishing the proof. $\square$

Theorem 4.6. *Let $P(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ with $\det P(x) \neq 0$. Then we have,*
a) All non-zero homomorphisms from $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N are of the form:

$$a(\partial, x)P(x) \mapsto S(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)R(x), \quad (4.7)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, and $R(x)$ and $S(x)$ are matrices in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ such that

$$P(x + \alpha) = R(x)S(x). \quad (4.8)$$

(b) All non-trivial anti-homomorphisms from $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N are of the form:

$$a(\partial, x)P(x) \mapsto A(\partial + x)a^t(\partial, -\partial - x + \alpha)B(x), \quad (4.9)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, and $A(x)$ and $B(x)$ are matrices in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ such that

$$P^t(-x + \alpha) = B(x)A(x). \quad (4.10)$$

(c) The conformal algebra $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ has an anti-automorphism (i.e. it is isomorphic to its opposite conformal algebra) if and only if the matrices $P^t(-x + \alpha)$ and $P(x)$ have the same elementary divisors for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. In this case, all anti-automorphisms of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ are of the form:

$$a(\partial, x)P(x) \mapsto Y(\partial + x)a^t(\partial, -\partial - x + \alpha)W(x)P(x), \quad (4.11)$$

where $Y(x)$ and $W(x)$ are invertible matrices in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ such that

$$P^t(-x + \alpha) = W(x)P(x)Y(x). \quad (4.12)$$

(d) The conformal algebra $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ has an anti-involution if and only if there exist an invertible in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ matrix $Y(x)$ such that

$$Y^t(-x + \alpha)P^t(-x + \alpha) = \epsilon P(x)Y(x) \quad (4.13)$$

for $\epsilon = 1$ or -1 . In this case all anti-involutions are given by

$$\sigma_{P,Y,\epsilon,\alpha}(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = \epsilon Y(\partial + x)a^t(\partial, -\partial - x + \alpha)Y^t(-x + \alpha)^{-1}P(x), \quad (4.14)$$

where $Y(x)$ is an invertible in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ matrix satisfying (4.13).

Proof. a) Follows by the end of proof of Theorem 3.10(b).

b) Since composition of two anti-homomorphisms is a homomorphism, using the anti-involution (4.1) we see that any anti-homomorphism must be of the form

$$a(\partial, x)P(x) \rightarrow R^t(-\partial - x)a^t(\partial, -\partial - x + \alpha)S^t(-x) \quad (4.15)$$

with $P(x+\alpha) = R(x)S(x)$. Then, (4.9) and (4.10) follows by taking $A(x) = S^t(-x)$ and $B(x) = R^t(-\partial - x)$.

c) Let ϕ be an anti-automorphism of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$. In particular, it is an anti-homomorphism as in part b), whose image is $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$. Then, for all $a(\partial, x)P(x) \in \text{Cend}_{N,P}$, we have that $\phi(a(\partial, x)p(x)) = A(\partial+x)a^t(\partial, -\partial-x+\alpha)B(x) \in \text{Cend}_{N,P}$. Then taking $a(\partial, x)$ the identity matrix we have that

$$A(\partial+x)B(x) = b(\partial, x)P(x), \quad \text{for some } b(\partial, x) \in \text{Cend}_{N,P}. \quad (4.16)$$

Recall that $P^t(-x+\alpha) = B(x)A(x)$. Taking determinant of both sides of (4.16), and comparing its highest degrees in x , we deduce that $\det b(\partial, x)$ and $\det A(x)$ are both (non-zero) constants. Now, from (4.16), we see that $A^{-1}(\partial+x)b(\partial, x)$ does not depend on ∂ . Then we have $B(x) = W(x)P(x)$, where $W(x) = A^{-1}(\partial+x)b(\partial, x)$ is an invertible matrix. Therefore,

$$\phi(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = A(\partial+x)a^t(\partial, -\partial-x+\alpha)W(x)P(x), \quad (4.17)$$

with A, W invertible matrices such that

$$W(x)P(x)A(x) = P^t(-x+\alpha). \quad (4.18)$$

d) Now suppose that ϕ is an anti-involution. Then it is as in (4.11), and it also satisfies $\phi^2 = id$. This condition implies that

$$a(\partial, x)P(x) = Y(\partial+x)W^t(-\partial-x+\alpha)a(\partial, x)Y^t(-x+\alpha)W(x)P(x) \quad (4.19)$$

for all $a(\partial, x) \in \text{Cend}_{N,P}$. Denote $Z(x) = Y^t(-x+\alpha)W(x)$. Taking $a(\partial, x) = Id$ in (4.19) and using that $\det P(x) \neq 0$, we have $Y(\partial+x)W^t(-\partial-x+\alpha) = Z^{-1}(x)$. Now, (4.19) becomes $a(\partial, x)P(x) = Z^{-1}(x)a(\partial, x)Z(x)P(x)$. Hence, we obtain $Z(x) = \varepsilon Id$, with $\varepsilon = 1$ or -1 . Thus, $Y^{-1}(X) = \varepsilon W^t(-x+\alpha)$. From (4.12) we deduce that

$$P(x)Y(x) = \varepsilon(P(-x+\alpha)Y(-x+\alpha))^t. \quad (4.20)$$

This condition is also sufficient. There exists an anti-involution if (4.20) holds for some invertible matrix Y , and it is given by

$$\phi(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = \varepsilon Y(\partial+x)a^t(\partial, -\partial-x+\alpha)Y^t(-x+\alpha)^{-1}P(x). \quad \square$$

Two anti-involutions σ, τ of an associative conformal algebra R are called *conjugate* if $\sigma = \varphi \circ \tau \circ \varphi^{-1}$ for some automorphism φ of R . Recall that two matrices a and b in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ are called α -congruent if $b = c^*ac$ for some invertible in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ matrix c , where $c(x)^* := c(-x+\alpha)^t$. We shall simply call them *congruent* if $\alpha = 0$. The following proposition gives us a characterization of equivalent anti-involutions $\sigma_{P,Y,\varepsilon,\alpha}$ in $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ (defined in (4.14)) and relates anti-involutions for different P .

Proposition 4.21. (a) The anti-involutions $\sigma_{P,Y_1,\epsilon_1,\alpha}$ and $\sigma_{P,Y_2,\epsilon_2,\gamma}$ of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ are conjugate if and only if $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2$ and $P(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})Y_2(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})$ is α -congruent to $P(x)Y_1(x)$.

(b) Let φ_Y be the automorphism of Cend_N given by

$$\varphi_Y(a(\partial, x)) = Y(\partial + x)^{-1}a(\partial, x)Y(x),$$

where Y is an invertible matrix in $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}[x]$, and let P and Y satisfying (4.13). Then

$$\sigma_{P,Y,\epsilon,\alpha} = \varphi_Y^{-1} \circ \sigma_{PY,I,\epsilon,\alpha} \circ \varphi_Y. \quad (4.22)$$

(c) Let c_α be the automorphism of Cend_N given by $c_\alpha(a(\partial, x)) = a(\partial, x + \alpha)$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $P^t(-x + \alpha) = \epsilon P(x)$, for $\epsilon = 1$ or -1 , then $Q(x) := P(x + \frac{\alpha}{2})$ satisfies $Q^t(-x) = \epsilon Q(x)$ and

$$\sigma_{P,I,\epsilon,\alpha} = c_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{Q,I,\epsilon,0} \circ c_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (4.23)$$

Proof. (a) Let $\varphi_{B,C,\alpha}$ be the automorphism of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ given by in (4.4) and (4.5). A straightforward computation shows that $\varphi_{B,C,\beta}^{-1} \circ \sigma_{P,Y,\epsilon,\alpha} \circ \varphi_{B,C,\beta} = \sigma_{P,\tilde{Y},\epsilon,2\beta+\alpha}$, where $\tilde{Y}(x) = C^{-1}(x - \beta)Y(x - \beta)B^t(-x + \alpha + \beta)$ and $P(x + \beta) = B(x)P(x)C(x)$. Hence, if $\sigma_{P,Y_1,\epsilon_1,\alpha}$ and $\sigma_{P,Y_2,\epsilon_2,\gamma}$ are conjugate, then $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2$ and $Y_2(x) = C^{-1}(x - \beta)Y(x - \beta)B^t(-x + \alpha + \beta)$, with $\beta = \gamma - \alpha/2$. Therefore, $P(x + \beta)Y_2(x + \beta) = B(x)P(x)Y_1(x)B^t(-x + \alpha)$, that is $P(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})Y_2(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})$ is α -congruent to $P(x)Y_1(x)$.

Conversely, suppose that $P(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})Y_2(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2}) = B(x)P(x)Y_1(x)B^t(-x + \alpha)$ for some $B(x)$ invertible matrix in $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}[x]$. Recall that Y_1 and Y_2 are invertibles. Then $C(x) := Y_1(x)B^t(-x + \alpha)Y_2(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})^{-1}$ is an invertible matrix in $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}[x]$, satisfies $P(x + \frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2}) = B(x)P(x)C(x)$, and it is easy to check that the anti-involutions are conjugated by the automorphism $\varphi_{B,C,\frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2}}$, proving (a). Part (b) and (c) are straightforward computations. $\square$

Theorem 4.24. Any anti-involution of Cend_N is, up to conjugation by an automorphism of Cend_N :

$$a(\partial, x) \mapsto a^*(\partial, -\partial - x),$$

where $*$ is the adjoint with respect to a non-degenerate symmetric or skew-symmetric bilinear form over $\mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Using Theorem 4.6(d), we have that any anti-involution of Cend_N has the form $\sigma(a(\partial, x)) = c(\partial + x)a(\partial, -\partial - x + \alpha)^t c(x)^{-1}$, where $c(x)$ is an invertible matrix such that $c(x)^t = \epsilon c(-x + \alpha)$, with $\epsilon = 1$ or -1 . By Proposition 4.21(c), we may suppose that $\alpha = 0$. Now, the proof follows because $c(x)$ is congruent to a constant symmetric or skew-symmetric matrix, by the following general theorem of Djokovic.

Theorem 4.25. (*Djokovic, [D1-2]*) *If A is invertible in $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$ and $A^* = A$ (resp. $A^* = -A$) where $A(x)^* = A(-x)$, then A is congruent to a symmetric (resp. skew-symmetric) matrix over $\mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. The symmetric case follows by Proposition 5 in [D1]. The skew-symmetric case was communicated to us by D. Djokovic and we will give the details here. Suppose $A^* = -A$. By Theorem (2.2.1), Ch. 7 in [Kn] it follows that A has to be isotropic, i.e. there exists a non-zero vector v in $\mathbb{C}[x]^N$ such that $v^*Av = 0$. We can assume that v is primitive (i.e., the greatest common divisor of its coordinates is 1). But then $\mathbb{C}[x]v$ is a direct summand: $\mathbb{C}[x]^N = \mathbb{C}[x]v \oplus M$, for some $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -submodule M of $\mathbb{C}[x]^N$. Then we have $\mathbb{C}[x]^N = (\mathbb{C}[x]v)^\perp \oplus M^\perp$ and $M^\perp$ is a free rank one $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module, that is $M^\perp = \mathbb{C}[x]w$ for some $w \in \mathbb{C}[x]^N$. Since $\mathbb{C}[x]v \subseteq (\mathbb{C}[x]v)^\perp$, the submodule $P = \mathbb{C}[x]v + \mathbb{C}[x]w$ is free of rank two. If $Q = M \cap (\mathbb{C}[x]v)^\perp$, then since $\mathbb{C}[x]v \subseteq (\mathbb{C}[x]v)^\perp$ we have $(\mathbb{C}[x]v)^\perp = \mathbb{C}[x]v \oplus Q$ and

$$\mathbb{C}[x]^N = (\mathbb{C}[x]v)^\perp \oplus \mathbb{C}[x]w = P \oplus Q.$$

Since $Q = P^\perp$, the submodule generated by v and w is a direct summand. Choose $w' \in P$ such that $v^*Aw' = 1$. Then v, w' must be a free basis of P and the corresponding 2×2 block is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & f \end{pmatrix}$$

for some skew element $f = g - g^*$ (cf. Proposition 5 [D1]). One can now replace f by 0, by taking the basis $v, w' - gv$, and use induction to finish the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.26. We do not know any counter-examples to the following generalization of Djokovic's theorem: If $A \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}[x])$ and $A^* = A$ (resp. $A^* = -A$) where $A(x)^* = A(-x)$, then A is congruent to a direct sum of 1×1 matrices of the form $(p(x))$ where p is an even (resp. odd) polynomial and 2×2 matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & q(x) \\ -q(x) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $q(x)$ is an odd (resp. even) polynomial.

As a consequence of Theorem 4.6, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.27. *Let $P(x), Q(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ be two non-degenerate matrices. Then $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ is isomorphic to $\text{Cend}_{N,Q}$ if and only if there exist $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $Q(x)$ and $P(x + \alpha)$ have the same elementary divisors.*

Proof. We may assume that P is diagonal. Let $\phi : \text{Cend}_{N,P} \rightarrow \text{Cend}_{N,Q}$ be an isomorphism. In particular it is a homomorphism from $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N whose

image is $\text{Cend}_{N,Q}$. Then, by Theorem 4.6(a), we have that $\phi(a(\partial, X)P(X)) = A(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)B(x)$, with $P(x + \alpha) = B(x)A(x)$. In particular

$$A(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)B(x) = Q(x) \quad (4.28)$$

for some $a(\partial, x)P(x) \in \text{Cend}_{N,P}$.

Taking determinant in both sides of (4.28), and comparing its highest degrees in ∂ , we can deduce that $\det A(x)$ is constant. Now, define the isomorphism $\phi_2 = \chi_A \circ \phi : \text{Cend}_{N,P} \rightarrow \text{Cend}_{N,Q,A}$, where $\chi_A(a(\partial, x)) = A^{-1}(\partial + x)a(\partial, x)A(x)$. Hence $\phi_2(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = a(\partial, x + \alpha)B(x)A(x)$. Since ϕ_2 is an isomorphism, we have that

$$B(x)A(x) = D(x)Q(x)A(x) \quad \text{and} \quad C(x)B(x)A(x) = Q(x)A(x)$$

for some $C(x)$ and $D(x)$ (obviously C and D does not depend on ∂). Comparing these two formulas, we have that $C(x)D(x) = Id$. Then both are invertible matrices, and $Q(x)A(x) = C(x)B(x)A(x) = C(x)P(x + \alpha)$ for some invertible matrices A and C . $\square$

5. ON IRREDUCIBLE SUBALGEBRAS OF CEND_N

In this section we study the conformal analog of the Burnside Theorem. A subalgebra of Cend_N is called irreducible if it acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. The following is the conjecture from [K2] on the classification of such subalgebras:

Conjecture 5.1. *Any irreducible subalgebra of Cend_N is either $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ with $\det P(x) \neq 0$ or $C(x + \partial) \text{Cur}_N C(x)^{-1}$ (i.e. is a conjugate of Cur_N), where $\det C(x) = 1$.*

The classification of finite irreducible subalgebras follows from the classification in [DK] at the Lie algebra level:

Theorem 5.2. *Any finite irreducible subalgebra of Cend_N is a conjugate of Cur_N .*

Proof. Let R be a finite irreducible subalgebra of Cend_N . Then the Lie conformal algebra R_- (with the bracket $[a_\lambda b] = a_\lambda b - b_{-\partial-\lambda}a$), of course, still acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. By the conformal analogue of the Cartan-Jacobson theorem [DK] applied to R_- , a conjugate R_1 of R either contains the element xI , or is contained in $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[\partial]$. The first case is ruled out since then R_1 is infinite. In the second case, by the same theorem, R_1 contains $\text{Cur } \mathfrak{g}$, where $\mathfrak{g} \subset \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$ is a simple Lie algebra acting irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}^N$, provided that $N > 1$.

By the classical Burnside theorem, we conclude that $R_1 = \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[\partial]$ in the case $N > 1$. It is immediate to see that the same is true if $N = 1$ (or we may apply Theorem 2.2). $\square$

Theorem 5.3. *If $S \subseteq \text{Cend}_N$ is an irreducible subalgebra such that S contains the identity matrix Id , then $S = \text{Cur}_N$ or $S = \text{Cend}_N$.*

Proof. Since $Id \in S$, and using the idea of (1.7), we have that $S = \mathbb{C}[\partial]A$, where $A = S \cap \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$. Observe that A is a subalgebra of $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$. Indeed,

$$P(x)Q(x) = P(x)_\lambda Q(x)|_{\lambda=-\partial} \in S \quad \text{for all } P, Q \in A.$$

In order to finish the proof, we should show that $A = \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$ or $A = \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$. Observe that A is invariant with respect to d/dx . Because $P(x)_\lambda(Id) = P(\lambda + \partial + x) \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes S$.

Let $A_0 \subset \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$ be the set of leading coefficients of matrices from A . This is obviously a subalgebra of $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$ that acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}^N$. Otherwise we would have a non-trivial A_0 -invariant subspace $u \subset \mathbb{C}^N$. Let U denote the space of vectors in $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ whose leading coefficients lie in u ; this is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -submodule. But we have:

$$a(x)_\lambda u(\partial) = a(\lambda + \partial)u(\lambda + \partial) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{\lambda^j}{j!} (a(\lambda + \partial)u(\lambda + \partial))^{(j)}|_{\lambda=0},$$

where (j) stands for j -th derivative. Since both A and U are invariant with respect to the derivative by the indeterminate, we conclude that U is invariant with respect to A , hence with respect to $S = \mathbb{C}[\partial]A$.

Thus, $A_0 = \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$. Therefore A is a subalgebra of $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ that contains $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$ and is d/dx -invariant. If A is larger than $\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$, applying d/dx a suitable number of times, we get that A contains a matrix of the form xa , where a is a non-zero constant matrix (we can always subtract the constant term). Hence $A \supset x(\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C})a(\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}) = x\text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$, hence A contains $x^k \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. $\square$

6. LIE CONFORMAL ALGEBRAS gc_N , $oc_{N,P}$ AND $spc_{N,P}$

A *Lie conformal algebra* R is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module endowed with a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $R \otimes R \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes R$, $a \otimes b \mapsto [a_\lambda b]$, called the λ -bracket, satisfying the following axioms ($a, b, c \in R$),

$$(C1)_\lambda \quad [(\partial a)_\lambda b] = -\lambda[a_\lambda b], \quad [a_\lambda(\partial b)] = (\lambda + \partial)[a_\lambda b]$$

$$(C2)_\lambda \quad [a_\lambda b] = -[a_{-\partial-\lambda} b]$$

$$(C3)_\lambda \quad [a_\lambda [b_\mu c]] = [[a_\lambda b]_{\lambda+\mu} c] + [b_\mu [a_\lambda c]].$$

A *module* M over a conformal algebra R is a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module endowed with a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $R \otimes M \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda] \otimes M$, $a \otimes v \mapsto a_\lambda v$, satisfying the following axioms ($a, b \in R$), $v \in M$,

$$(M1)_\lambda \quad (\partial a)_\lambda^M v = [\partial^M, a_\lambda^M] v = -\lambda a_\lambda^M v,$$

$$(M2)_\lambda \quad [a_\lambda^M, b_\mu^M] v = [a_\lambda b]_{\lambda+\mu}^M v.$$

Let U and V be modules over a conformal algebra R . Then, the $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module $N := \text{Chom}(U, V)$ has an R -module structure defined by

$$(a_\lambda^N \varphi)_\mu u = a_\lambda^V (\varphi_{\mu-\lambda} u) - \varphi_{\mu-\lambda} (a_\lambda^U u), \quad (6.1)$$

where $a \in R$, $\varphi \in N$ and $u \in U$. Therefore, one can define the contragradient conformal R -module $U^* = \text{Chom}(U, \mathbb{C})$, where $\mathbb{C}$ is viewed as the trivial R -module and $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module. We also define the tensor product $U \otimes V$ of R -modules as the ordinary tensor product with $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module structure ($u \in U, v \in V$):

$$\partial(u \otimes v) = \partial u \otimes v + u \otimes \partial v$$

and λ -action defined by ($r \in R$):

$$r_\lambda(u \otimes v) = r_\lambda u \otimes v + u \otimes r_\lambda v.$$

Proposition 6.2. *Let U and V be two R -modules. Suppose that U has finite rank as a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module. Then $U^* \otimes V \simeq \text{Chom}(U, V)$ as R -modules, with the identification $(f \otimes v)_\lambda(u) = f_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) v$, $f \in U^*$, $u \in U$ and $v \in V$.*

Proof. Define $\varphi : U^* \otimes V \rightarrow \text{Chom}(U, V)$ by $\varphi(f \otimes v)_\lambda(u) = f_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) v$. Observe that φ is $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -linear, since

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\partial(f \otimes v))_\lambda(u) &= \varphi(\partial f \otimes v + f \otimes \partial v)_\lambda(u) = (\partial f)_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) v + f_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) \partial v \\ &= -(\lambda + \partial^V) f_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) v + f_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) \partial v = -\lambda f_{\lambda+\partial^V}(u) v \\ &= -\lambda \varphi(f \otimes v)_\lambda(u) = \partial(\varphi(f \otimes v))_\lambda(u) \end{aligned}$$

and φ is a homomorphism, since

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(r_\lambda(f \otimes v))_\mu(u) &= \varphi(r_\lambda f \otimes v + f \otimes r_\lambda v)_\mu(u) \\ &= (r_\lambda f)_{\mu+\partial^V}(u) v + f_{\mu+\partial^V}(u) (r_\lambda v) \\ &= -f_{\mu-\lambda+\partial^V}(r_\lambda u) v + f_{\mu+\partial^V}(u) (r_\lambda v) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (r_\lambda(\varphi(f \otimes v)))_\mu(u) &= r_\lambda(\varphi(f \otimes v)_{\mu-\lambda}(u)) - \varphi(f \otimes v)_{\mu-\lambda}(r_\lambda u) \\ &= r_\lambda(f_{\mu-\lambda+\partial^V}(u) v) - f_{\mu-\lambda+\partial^V}(r_\lambda u) v \\ &= f_{\mu+\partial^V}(u) (r_\lambda v) - f_{\mu-\lambda+\partial^V}(r_\lambda u) v. \end{aligned}$$

The homomorphism φ is always injective. Indeed, if $\varphi(f \otimes v) = 0$, then $f_{\mu+\partial^V}(u)v = 0$ for all $u \in U$. Suppose that $v \neq 0$, then $f_{\lambda+\partial^V} = 0$, that is $f = 0$.

It remains to prove that φ is surjective provided that U has finite rank as a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module. Let $g \in \text{Chom}(U, V)$, and $U = \mathbb{C}[\partial]\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$. Then, there exist $v_{ik} \in U$ such that

$$g_\lambda(u_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{m_i} (\lambda + \partial^V)^k v_{ik} = \sum_{k=0}^{m_i} \varphi(f_{ik} \otimes v_{ik})_\lambda(u_i),$$

where $f_{ik} \in U^*$ is defined (on generators) by $f_{ik}(u_j) = \delta_{i,j} \lambda^k$. Therefore, $g = \varphi(\sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=0}^{m_i} f_{ik} \otimes v_{ik})$, finishing the proof. $\square$

In general, given any associative conformal algebra R with λ -product $a_\lambda b$, the λ -bracket defined by

$$[a_\lambda b] := a_\lambda b - b_{-\partial-\lambda} a \quad (6.3)$$

makes R a Lie conformal algebra.

Let V be a finite $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module. The λ -bracket (6.3) on $\text{Cend } V$, makes it a Lie conformal algebra denoted by $gc V$ and called the *general conformal algebra* (see [DK], [K1] and [K2]). For any positive integer N , we define $gc_N := gc \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N = \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[\partial, x]$, and the λ -bracket (6.3) is by (1.1):

$$[A(\partial, x)_\lambda B(\partial, x)] = A(-\lambda, x + \lambda + \partial) B(\lambda + \partial, x) - B(\lambda + \partial, -\lambda + x) A(-\lambda, x).$$

Recall that, by Theorem 4.24, any anti-involution in Cend_N is, up to conjugation

$$\sigma_*(A(\partial, x)) = A^*(\partial, -\partial - x), \quad (6.4)$$

where $*$ stands for the adjoint with respect to a non-degenerate symmetric or skew-symmetric bilinear form over $\mathbb{C}$. These anti-involutions give us two important subalgebras of gc_N : the set of $-\sigma_*$ fixed points is the *orthogonal conformal algebra* oc_N (resp. the *symplectic conformal algebra* spc_N), in the symmetric (resp. skew-symmetric) case.

Proposition 6.5. *The subalgebras oc_N and spc_N are simple.*

Proof. We will prove that oc_N is simple. The proof for spc_N is similar. Let I be a non-zero ideal of oc_N . Let $0 \neq A(\partial, x) \in I$, then $A(\partial, x) = \sum_{i=0}^m \partial^i a_i(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n \partial^j \tilde{a}_j(\partial + x)$, with $a_i(x), \tilde{a}_j(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$. Now, using that $A(\partial, x) = -A^t(\partial, -\partial - x)$, we obtain that $n = m$ and $a_i(x) = -\tilde{a}_i^t(-x)$. Computing the λ -bracket

$$[xE_{ij} - (-\partial - x)E_{ji} \lambda A(\partial, x)] = \lambda^{m+1}(E_{ij}a_m(x) - a_m^t(-\partial - x)E_{ji}) + \lambda^m \dots$$

we deduce that $E_{ij}a_m(x) - a_m^t(-\partial - x)E_{ji} \in I$, with $a_m \neq 0$. By taking appropriate i and j , we have that there exist polynomials $b_k(x)$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^N (b_k(x)E_{ik} - b_k(-\partial - x)E_{ki}) \in I$, with $b_r \neq 0$ for some $r \neq i$. Now by computing $[(2x + \partial)E_{rr} \lambda \sum_{k=1}^N (b_k(x)E_{ik} - b_k(-\partial - x)E_{ki})]$ and looking at its leading coefficient in λ , we show that $E_{ri} - E_{ir} \in I$, with $r \neq i$. Taking brackets with elements in o_N , we have $E_{jl} - E_{lj} \in I$ for all $j \neq l$. Now, we can see from the λ -brackets $[xE_{ri} - (-\partial - x)E_{ir} \lambda E_{ir} - E_{ri}] = (2x + \partial)(E_{ii} - E_{rr})$ and $[(2x + \partial)E_{ii} \lambda (2x + \partial)(E_{ii} - E_{rr})] = \lambda(2x + \partial)E_{ii}$, that $(2x + \partial)E_{ii} \in I$ for all i . The other generators are obtained by $(k \neq i, j)$

$$[(-x)^k E_{ik} - (\partial + x)^k E_{ki} \lambda E_{jk} - E_{kj}]|_{\lambda=0} = x^k E_{ij} - (-\partial - x)^k E_{ji}.$$

Similarly, we can see that $(x^k - (-\partial - x)^k)E_{ii} \in I$, finishing the proof. $\square$

The conformal subalgebras oc_N and spc_N , as well as the anti-involutions given by (6.4), and their generalizations can be described in terms of conformal bilinear forms. Let V be a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module. A *conformal bilinear form* on V is a $\mathbb{C}$ -bilinear map $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda]$ such that

$$\langle \partial v, w \rangle_\lambda = -\lambda \langle v, w \rangle_\lambda = -\langle v, \partial w \rangle_\lambda, \quad \text{for all } v, w \in V.$$

The conformal bilinear form is *non-degenerate* if $\langle v, w \rangle_\lambda = 0$ for all $w \in V$, implies $v = 0$. The conformal bilinear form is *symmetric* (resp. *skew-symmetric*) if $\langle v, w \rangle_\lambda = \epsilon \langle w, v \rangle_{-\lambda}$ for all $v, w \in V$, with $\epsilon = 1$ (resp. $\epsilon = -1$).

Given a conformal bilinear form on a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module V , we have a homomorphism of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -modules, $L : V \rightarrow V^*$, $v \mapsto L_v$, given as usual by

$$(L_v)_\lambda w = \langle v, w \rangle_\lambda, \quad v \in V. \quad (6.6)$$

Let V be a free finite rank $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module and fix $\beta = \{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ a $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -basis of V . Then *the matrix of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ with respect to β* is defined as $P_{i,j}(\lambda) = \langle e_i, e_j \rangle_\lambda$. Hence, identifying V with $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$, we have

$$\langle v(\partial), w(\partial) \rangle_\lambda = v^t(-\lambda)P(\lambda)w(\lambda). \quad (6.7)$$

Observe that $P^t(-x) = \epsilon P(x)$ with $\epsilon = 1$ (resp. $\epsilon = -1$) if the conformal bilinear form is symmetric (resp. skewsymmetric). We also have that $\text{Im } L = P(-\partial)V^*$, where L is defined in (6.6). Indeed, given $v(\partial) \in V$, consider $g_\lambda \in V^*$ defined by $g_\lambda(w(\partial)) = v^t(-\lambda)w(\lambda)$, then by (6.7)

$$(L_{v(\partial)})_\lambda w(\partial) = v^t(-\lambda)P(\lambda)w(\lambda) = g_\lambda(P(\partial)w(\partial)) = (P(-\partial)g)_\lambda(w(\partial)),$$

where in the last equality we are identifying V^* with $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ in the natural way, that is $f \in V^*$ corresponds to $(f_{-\partial e_1}, \dots, f_{-\partial e_N}) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. Therefore, if the conformal bilinear form is non-degenerate, then L gives an isomorphism between V and $P(-\partial)V^*$, with $\det P \neq 0$.

Suppose that we have a non-degenerate conformal bilinear form on $V = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ which is also symmetric or skew-symmetric. Denote by $P(\lambda)$ the matrix of this bilinear form with respect to the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. Then for each $a \in \text{Cend}_N$ and $w \in V$, the map $f_\lambda^{a,w}(v) := \langle w, a_\mu v \rangle_{\lambda-\mu}$ is in $\mathbb{C}[\mu] \otimes V^*$, that is $f_\lambda^{a,w}$ is a $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map, $f_\lambda^{a,w}(\partial v) = \lambda f_\lambda^{a,w}(v)$ and depends polynomially on μ , because $\deg_\mu f_\lambda^{a,w}(v) \leq \max\{\deg_\mu f_\lambda^{a,w}(e_i) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Observe that if we restrict to $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$, then $f_\lambda^{aP,w} = (P(-\partial)f^{a,w})_\lambda \in \text{Im } L$. Therefore, since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ is non-degenerate, there exists a unique $(aP)_\mu^* w \in \mathbb{C}[\mu] \otimes V$ such that $f_\lambda^{aP,w}(v) = \langle w, aP_\mu v \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} = \langle (aP)_\mu^* w, v \rangle_\lambda$. Thus, we have attached to each $aP \in \text{Cend}_{N,P}$ a map $(aP)^* : V \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mu] \otimes V$, $w \mapsto (aP)_\mu^* w$, where the vector $(aP)_\mu^* w$ is determined by the identity

$$\langle aP_\mu v, w \rangle_\lambda = \langle v, (aP)_\mu^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu}.$$

Observe that $(aP)_\mu^*(\partial w) = (\partial + \mu)(aP)_\mu^* w$, that is $(aP)^* \in \text{Cend } V$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, (aP)_\mu^*(\partial w) \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} &= \langle aP_\mu v, \partial w \rangle_\lambda = \lambda \langle aP_\mu v, w \rangle_\lambda \\ &= -\langle \partial(aP_\mu v), w \rangle_\lambda = \langle \mu aP_\mu v, w \rangle_\lambda - \langle aP_\mu \partial v, w \rangle_\lambda \\ &= \mu \langle v, (aP)_\mu^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} - \langle \partial v, (aP)_\mu^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} \\ &= \langle v, (\mu + \partial)(aP)_\mu^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover we have the following result:

Proposition 6.8. (a) Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ be a non-degenerate symmetric or skew-symmetric conformal bilinear form on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$, and denote by $P(\lambda)$ the matrix of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ with respect to the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ over $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$. Then the map $aP \mapsto (aP)^*$ from $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N defined by

$$\langle a_\mu v, w \rangle_\lambda = \langle v, a_\mu^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu}. \quad (6.9)$$

is the anti-involution of $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ given by

$$(a(\partial, x)P(x))^* = \epsilon a^t(\partial, -\partial - x)P(x), \quad (6.10)$$

where $P^t(-x) = \epsilon P(x)$ with $\epsilon = 1$ or -1 , depending on whether the conformal bilinear form is symmetric or skew-symmetric.

(b) Consider the Lie conformal subalgebra of gc_N defined by

$$\begin{aligned} g_* &= \{a \in \text{Cend}_{N,P} : a^* = -a\} \\ &= \{a \in \text{Cend}_{N,P} : \langle a_\mu v, w \rangle_\lambda + \langle v, a_\mu w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} = 0, \quad \text{for all } v, w \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $*$ is defined by (6.10). Then under the pairing (6.6) we have $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \simeq P(-\partial)(\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N)^*$ as g_* -modules.

Proof. (a) First let us check that $\varphi(aP) = (aP)^*$ defines an anti-homomorphism from $\text{Cend}_{N,P}$ to Cend_N . Since $(a, b \in \text{Cend}_{N,P})$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, (a_\mu b)_\gamma^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\gamma} &= \langle (a_\mu b)_\gamma v, w \rangle_\lambda = \langle a_\mu (b_{\gamma-\mu} v), w \rangle_\lambda \\ &= \langle b_{\gamma-\mu} v, a_\mu^* w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} = \langle v, b_{\gamma-\mu}^* (a_\mu^* w) \rangle_{\lambda-\gamma} \\ &= \langle v, (b_{\gamma-\mu}^* a_\mu^*)_\gamma w \rangle_{\lambda-\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

we have that $\varphi(a_\mu b)_\gamma = (\varphi(b)_{\gamma-\mu} \varphi(a))_\gamma = (\varphi(b)_{\partial-\mu} \varphi(a))_\gamma$.

Now, using Theorem 4.6(b), we have that

$$\varphi(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = A(\partial + x)a^t(\partial, -\partial - x + \alpha)B(x),$$

with $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $P^t(-x + \alpha) = B(x)A(x)$. Replacing $\varphi(aP)$ in (6.9) and using (6.7), we obtain

$$P(\lambda - \mu)a^t(-\mu, \mu - \lambda)P(\lambda) = P(\lambda - \mu)A(\lambda - \mu)a^t(-\mu, \mu - \lambda + \alpha)B(\lambda), \quad \text{for all } a(\partial, x). \quad (6.11)$$

Taking $a(\partial, x) = I$ and using that $\det P \neq 0$, we have $P(\lambda) = A(\lambda - \mu)B(\lambda)$. Since the left hand side does not depend on μ , we get $A = A(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}$, with $\det A \neq 0$. Using that $\epsilon P(x - \alpha) = P^t(-x + \alpha) = B(x)A$, then (6.11) become

$$a^t(-\mu, \mu - \lambda)\epsilon B(\lambda + \alpha)A = Aa^t(-\mu, \mu - \lambda + \alpha)B(\lambda), \quad \text{for all } a(\partial, x).$$

In particular, we have $\epsilon B(\lambda + \alpha)A = AB(\lambda)$. Hence $a^t(-\mu, \mu - \lambda)A = Aa^t(-\mu, \mu - \lambda + \alpha)$ for all $a(\partial, x)$, getting $\alpha = 0$ and $A = cI$. Therefore,

$$\varphi(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = \epsilon a^t(\partial, -\partial - x)P(x),$$

with $P^t(-x) = \epsilon P(x)$ with $\epsilon = 1$ or -1 , depending on whether the conformal bilinear form is symmetric or skew-symmetric, getting (a).

(b) Using (6.6), we obtain for all $a \in g_*$ and $v, w \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ that

$$(L_{a_\mu v})_\lambda(w) = \langle a_\mu v, w \rangle_\lambda = -\langle v, a_\mu w \rangle_{\lambda-\mu} = -(L_v)_{\lambda-\mu}(a_\mu w) = (a_\mu(L_v))_\lambda(w).$$

finishing the proof. $\square$

Observe that oc_N (resp. spc_N), can be described as the subalgebra g_* of gc_N in Theorem 6.8(b), with respect to the conformal bilinear form

$$\langle p(\partial)v, q(\partial)w \rangle_\lambda = p(-\lambda)q(\lambda)(v, w) \quad \text{for all } v, w \in \mathbb{C}^N,$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a non-degenerate symmetric (resp. skew-symmetric) bilinear form on $\mathbb{C}^N$. For general P , see (6.16) below.

Then, oc_N (resp. spc_N) is the $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -span of $\{y_A^n := x^n A - (-\partial - x)^n A^* : A \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}\}$, where $*$ stands for the adjoint with respect to a non-degenerate symmetric (resp. skew-symmetric) bilinear form over $\mathbb{C}$. Therefore we have that $gc_N = oc_N \oplus M_N$ (resp. $gc_N = spc_N \oplus M_N$), where M_N is the set of σ_* -fixed points, i.e.

$$M_N = \mathbb{C}[\partial]\text{-span of } \{w_A^n := x^n A + (-\partial - x)^n A^* : A \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}\}. \quad (6.12)$$

We are using the same notation M_N in the symmetric and skew-symmetric case. Observe that M_N is an oc_N -module (resp. spc_N -module) with the action given by

$$\begin{aligned} y_A^n \lambda w_B^m &= (\lambda + \partial + w_{AB})^n w_{AB}^m - (-\partial - w_{A^*B})^n w_{A^*B}^m \\ &\quad + (-1)^n (-\lambda - \partial - w_{AB^*})^{m+n} - (-\lambda + w_{BA})^m w_{BA}^n \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

Let us give a more conceptual understanding of the module M_N . Let $V = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. By definition, $V^* = \text{Chom}(V, \mathbb{C}) = \{\alpha : \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\lambda] : \alpha_\lambda \partial = \lambda \alpha_\lambda\}$ and given $\alpha \in V^*$ it is completely determined by the values in the canonical basis $\{e_i\}$ of $\mathbb{C}^N$, this is $p_\alpha(\lambda) := (\alpha_\lambda e_1, \dots, \alpha_\lambda e_N) \in \mathbb{C}[\lambda]^N$. Thus, we may identify $V^* \simeq \mathbb{C}[\lambda]^N$ and $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module structure given by $(\partial p)(\lambda) = -\lambda p(\lambda)$.

We have that gc_N acts on V by the λ -action

$$A(\partial, x) \lambda v(\partial) = A(-\lambda, \lambda + \partial) v(\lambda + \partial), \quad v(\partial) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N,$$

and on V^* by the contragradient action, given by

$$A(\partial, x) \lambda v(\partial) = -{}^t A(-\lambda, -\partial) v(\lambda + \partial), \quad v(\partial) \in \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N.$$

It is easy to check that $(V^*)^* \simeq V$ as gc_N -modules. Observe that by Proposition 6.8(b), $V \simeq V^*$ as oc_N -modules and spc_N -modules.

We define the 2nd exterior power $\Lambda^2(V)$ and the 2nd symmetric power $S^2(V)$ in the usual way with the induced $\mathbb{C}[\partial]$ -module and gc_N -module structures.

Proposition 6.14. (a) $V \otimes V = S^2(V) \oplus \Lambda^2(V)$ is the decomposition of $V \otimes V$ into a direct sum of irreducible gc_N -modules. And $V^* \otimes V$ is isomorphic to the adjoint representation of gc_N .

(b) $gc_N \simeq V \otimes V = S^2(V) \oplus \Lambda^2(V)$ is the decomposition of gc_N into a direct sum of irreducible oc_N -modules, where $\Lambda^2(V)$ is isomorphic to the adjoint representation of oc_N , and $M_N \simeq S^2(V)$ as oc_N -modules.

(c) $gc_N \simeq V \otimes V = S^2(V) \oplus \Lambda^2(V)$ is the decomposition of gc_N into a direct sum of irreducible spc_N -modules, where $S^2(V)$ is isomorphic to the adjoint representation of spc_N , and $M_N \simeq \Lambda^2(V)$ as spc_N -modules.

Proof. (a) Follows from Proposition 6.2 and part (b).

(b) Define $\varphi : V \otimes V \rightarrow gc_N$ by

$$\varphi(p(\partial)e_i \otimes q(\partial)e_j) = p(-x)q(x + \partial)E_{ji}$$

It is easy to check that this is an oc_N -module isomorphism. Note that σ_* defined in (6.4) corresponds via φ to $\sigma(p(\partial)e_i \otimes q(\partial)e_j) = q(\partial)e_j \otimes p(\partial)e_i$. Therefore it is immediate that $M_N \simeq S^2(V)$ and $\Lambda^2(V) \simeq oc_N$. It remains to see that M_N is an irreducible oc_N -module. Let $W \neq 0$ be a oc_N -submodule of M_N and $0 \neq w(\partial, x) = \sum_{i,j} q_{ij}(\partial, x)E_{ij} \in W$. We may suppose that $q_{11} \neq 0$. Computing $[y_{E_{11}}^1 \lambda w(\partial, x)]$ and looking at the highest degree of λ that appears in the component E_{11} , we deduce that there exists in W an element of the form $w' = \sum_i (p_i(\partial, x)E_{1i} + q_i(\partial, x)E_{i1})$, with $p_1 = q_1 = 1$. Now, computing $[y_{E_{12}}^1 \lambda w'(\partial, x)]$ we have that $w'' = r(\partial, x)E_{11} + w_{E_{12}}^1 +$ terms out of the first column and row $\in W$. And from $[y_{E_{11}}^1 \lambda w''(\partial, x)]$ and looking at the highest degree in λ , we have that if $r(\partial, x)$ is non constant, $w_{E_{11}}^0 \in W$, and if $r(\partial, x)$ is constant, $w_{E_{11}}^0 + w_{E_{12}}^1 \in W$. In both cases, by (6.6) we have that $w_I^0 \in W$. Now, looking at $(n \gg 0$ and A arbitrary)

$$y_A^n \lambda w_I^0 = \lambda^n 2w_A^0 + \lambda^{n-1} 2n(\partial w_A^0 + w_A^1) + \lambda^{n-2} 2 \binom{n}{2} (\partial^2 w_A^0 + 2\partial w_A^1 + w_A^2) + \dots$$

we get $W = M_N$, finishing part (b).

(c) The proof is similar to (b), with $\varphi : V \otimes V \rightarrow gc_N$ defined by $\varphi(p(\partial)e_i \otimes q(\partial)e_j) = p(-x)q(x + \partial)E_{ij}^\dagger$, where $E_{ij}^\dagger = -E_{j, \frac{N}{2}+i}$, $E_{\frac{N}{2}+i, \frac{N}{2}+j}^\dagger = E_{\frac{N}{2}+j, i}$, $E_{i, \frac{N}{2}+j}^\dagger = -E_{\frac{N}{2}+j, \frac{N}{2}+i}$ and $E_{\frac{N}{2}+i, j}^\dagger = -E_{j, i}$, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq \frac{N}{2}$. $\square$

Observe that $gc_{N,P} := gc_N P(x)$ is a conformal subalgebra of gc_N , for any $P(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$.

A matrix $Q(x) \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}[x]$ will be called *hermitian* (resp. *skew-hermitian*) if

$$Q^t(-x) = \varepsilon Q(x) \quad \text{with } \varepsilon = 1 \quad (\text{resp. } \varepsilon = -1).$$

Denote by $o_{P,Y,\varepsilon,\alpha}$ the subalgebra of $gc_{N,P}$ of $-\sigma_{P,Y,\varepsilon,\alpha}$ -fixed points. By Proposition 4.21 (b)-(c), we have the following isomorphisms, obtained by conjugating by automorphisms of Cend_N

$$o_{P,Y,\varepsilon,\alpha} \simeq o_{PY,I,\varepsilon,\alpha} \simeq o_{Q,I,\varepsilon,0}, \quad (6.15)$$

where $Q(x) = (PY)(x + \alpha/2)$ is hermitian or skew-hermitian, depending on whether $\varepsilon = 1$ or -1 . Therefore, up to conjugacy, we may restrict our attention to the family of subalgebras (6.15), that is it suffices to consider the anti-involutions

$$\sigma_{P,I,\varepsilon,0}(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = \varepsilon a^t(\partial, -\partial - x)P(x)$$

where P is non-degenerate hermitian or skew-hermitian, depending on whether $\varepsilon = 1$ or -1 . From now on we shall use the following notation

$$\begin{aligned} oc_{N,P} &:= o_{P,I,1,0} && \text{if } P \text{ is hermitian} \\ spc_{N,P} &:= o_{P,I,-1,0} && \text{if } P \text{ is skew-hermitian.} \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

These subalgebras are those obtained in Theorem 6.8(b) in a more invariant form. In the special case $N = 1$ and $P(x) = x$, the involution $\sigma_{x,I,-1,0}$ is the conformal version of the involution given by Bloch in [B].

Note that $gc_{N,P} \simeq oc_N \cdot P(x) \oplus M_N \cdot P(x)$. If P is hermitian, then $oc_{N,P} = oc_N \cdot P(x)$ and $M_N \cdot P(x)$ is an $oc_{N,P}$ -module. If P is skew-hermitian, then $spc_{N,P} = M_N \cdot P(x)$, and $oc_N \cdot P(x)$ is a $spc_{N,P}$ -module.

Remark 6.17. (a) The subalgebras gc_N , $gc_{N,xI}$, oc_N and $spc_{N,xI}$ contain the conformal Virasoro subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[\partial](x + \alpha\partial)I$, for α arbitrary, $\alpha = 0$, $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha = 0$ respectively.

(b) Let $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then by (6.15) we obtain

$$spc_N = o_{I,J,-1,0} \simeq o_{J,I,-1,0} = spc_{N,J}.$$

(c) Using the proof of Proposition 6.5, one can prove that $oc_{N,P}$ and $spc_{N,P}$, with $\det P(x) \neq 0$, are simple if $P(x)$ satisfies the property that for each i there exists j such that $\deg P_{ij}(x) > \deg P_{ik}(x)$ for all $k \neq j$.

Proposition 6.18. *The subalgebras $oc_{N,P}$ and $spc_{N,P}$, with $\det P(x) \neq 0$, acts irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$.*

Proof. Let M be a non-zero $oc_{N,P}$ -submodule of $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ and take $0 \neq v(\partial) \in M$. Since $\det P(x) \neq 0$, there exists i such that $P(y)v(y)$ has non-zero i th-coordinate that we shall denote by $b(y)$. Recall that $\{(x^k A - (-\partial - x)^k A^t)P(x) \mid A \in \text{Mat}_N \mathbb{C}\}$ generates $oc_{N,P}$. Now, looking at the highest degree in λ in

$$(2x + \partial)E_{ii}P(x) \lambda v(\partial) = (\lambda + 2\partial)b(\partial + \lambda)e_i$$

we deduce that $e_i \in M$. Now, since the i th-column of $P = (P_{r,j})$ is non-zero, we can take k such that $P_{k,i}(x) \neq 0$ has maximal degree in x , in the i th-column. Then, considering the λ action of $(xE_{jk} - (-\partial - x)E_{kj})P(x)$ on e_i , for $j = 1, \dots, N$, and looking at the highest degree in λ , we have that $e_j \in M$ for all $j = 1, \dots, N$. Therefore $M = \mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$. A similar argument also works for $spc_{N,P}$. $\square$

Proposition 6.19. (a) *The subalgebras $oc_{N,P}$ and $oc_{N,Q}$ (resp. $spc_{N,P}$ and $spc_{N,Q}$) are conjugated by an automorphism of Cend_N if and only if P and Q are congruent hermitian (resp. skew-hermitian) matrices.*

(b) *The subalgebras $oc_{N,P}$ and $spc_{N,Q}$ are not conjugated by any automorphism of $Cend_N$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.2, any automorphism of $Cend_N$ has the form $\varphi_A(a(\partial, x)) = A(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)A(x)^{-1}$, with $A(x)$ an invertible matrix in $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}[x]$. Suppose that the restriction of φ_A to $oc_{N,P}$ gives us an isomorphism between $oc_{N,P}$ and $oc_{N,Q}$. Then $\varphi_A(a(\partial, x)P(x)) = A(\partial + x)a(\partial, x + \alpha)D(x)Q(x)$ for all $a(\partial, x) \in oc_N$, where D is an invertible matrix in $\text{Mat}_N\mathbb{C}[x]$ and $P(x + \alpha) = D(x)Q(x)A(x)$. But the image is in $oc_{N,Q}$ if and only if (applying $\sigma_{Q,I,1,0}$)

$$a(\partial, x - \alpha)R(x) = R^t(-\partial - x)a(\partial, x + \alpha) \quad \text{for all } a(\partial, x) \in oc_N,$$

where $R(x) = A^t(-x)D(x)^{-1}$. Therefore, we must have $\alpha = 0$ and $R = cId$ ($c \in \mathbb{C}$), that is $D(x) = cA^t(-x)$. Hence $P(x) = cA^t(-x)Q(x)A(x)$, proving (a). Part (b) follows by similar arguments. $\square$

A classification of finite irreducible subalgebras of gc_N was given in [DK]. In view of the discussion of this section, it is natural to propose the following conjecture.

Conjecture 6.20. *Any infinite Lie conformal subalgebra of gc_N acting irreducibly on $\mathbb{C}[\partial]^N$ is conjugate by an automorphism of $Cend_N$ to one of the following subalgebras:*

- (a) $gc_{N,P}$, where $\det P \neq 0$,
- (b) $oc_{N,P}$, where $\det P \neq 0$ and $P(-x) = P^t(x)$,
- (c) $spc_{N,P}$, where $\det P \neq 0$ and $P(-x) = -P^t(x)$.

Acknowledgment. C. Boyallian and J. Liberati were supported in part by Conicet, ANPCyT, Agencia Cba Ciencia, Secyt-UNC and Fomec (Argentina). V. Kac was supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-9970007. Special thanks go to MSRI (Berkeley) for the hospitality during our stay there.

REFERENCES

- [BKV] B. Bakalov, V. Kac and A. Voronov, *Cohomology of conformal algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **200** (1999), 561-598.
- [B] S. Bloch, *Zeta values and differential operators on the circle*, J. Algebra **182** (1996), 476-500.
- [Bo] R. Borcherds, *Vertex algebras, Kac-Moody algebras, and the monster*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **83** (1986), 3068-3071.
- [BPZ] A. Belavin, A. Polyakov and A. Zamolodchikov, *Infinite conformal symmetry in two-dimensional quantum field theory*, Nuclear Phys. **B 241** (1984), no. 2, 333-380.
- [CK] S. Cheng and V. Kac, *Conformal modules*, Asian J. Math. **1** (1997), no1, 181-193.
- [CKW] S. Cheng, V. Kac and M. Wakimoto, *Extensions of conformal modules in "Topological field theory, primitive forms and related topics (Kyoto), 33-57, Progress in Math. 160, Birkhauser, Boston, 1998, preprint q-alg/9709019.*

- [D1] D.Z. Djokovic, *Hermitian matrices over polynomial rings*, J. Algebra **43** (1976), no. 2, 359-374.
- [D2] D.Z. Djokovic, *Private communication*.
- [DK] A. D'Andrea and V. Kac, *Structure theory of finite conformal algebras*, Selecta Math. **4** (1998), no. 3, 377-418.
- [DeK] A. De Sole and V. Kac, *Subalgebras of gc_N and Jacobi polynomials*, preprint math-ph/0112028.
- [K1] V. Kac, *Vertex algebras for beginners. Second edition*, American Mathematical Society, 1998.
- [K2] V. Kac, *Formal distributions algebras and conformal algebras*, in Proc. XIIth International Congress of Mathematical Physics (ICMP '97)(Brisbane), 80-97, Internat. Press, Cambridge 1999; preprint math.QA/9709027.
- [Kn] M. Knus, *Quadratic and hermitian forms over rings*, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [KR] V. Kac and A. Radul, *Quasifinite highest weight modules over the Lie algebra of differential operators on the circle*, Comm. Math. Phys. **157** (1993), 429-457.
- [KWY] V. Kac, W. Wang and C. Yan, *Quasifinite representations of classical Lie subalgebras of $W_{1+\infty}$* , Adv. Math. **139** (1998), 56-140.
- [R] A. Retakh, *Associative conformal algebras of linear growth*, J. Algebra **237** (2001), 169-788.
- [Z] E. Zelmanov, *On the structure of conformal algebras*, Combinatorial and computational algebra (Hong Kong, 1999), 139-153, Contemp. Math., 264, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.

CIEM - FAMAF UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE CÓRDOBA - (5000) CÓRDOBA, ARGENTINA
E-mail address: boyallia@mate.uncor.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIT, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139, USA
E-mail address: kac@math.mit.edu

CIEM - FAMAF UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE CÓRDOBA - (5000) CÓRDOBA, ARGENTINA
E-mail address: liberati@mate.uncor.edu